BAR BULLETIN

PUBLISHED BY THE LOS ANGELES BAR ASSOCIATION

LEADING ARTICLES

Vol. 14 MARCH, 1939 No. 7

BAR BULLETIN

Official Monthly Publication of Los Angeles Bar Association. Entered as second-class matter May 5, 1938, at the Postoffice at Los Angeles, California, under Act of March 3, 1879.
Subscription Price $1.00 a Year; 10c a Copy

VOL. 14 | MARCH, 1939 | No. 6

"TRIAL CLINIC" AROUSES INTEREST

LARGE ATTENDANCE OF LAWYERS

WHEN the Bar Association Committee arranged to conduct a "trial clinic," designed to improve methods of trial technique, it did not anticipate the number of lawyers who would register for the course of four sessions. To the surprise of everyone, the courtroom of Department One of the Superior Court was crowded to the point of standing room, with 180 Bar members, on March 7, when the fictitious personal injury case of Smith v. Jones Truck Company was called for trial.

Chairman Harry J. McClean made an opening statement of the purpose of the experiment as a service of the Association to the lawyers of the county, and called Byron Hanna to the bench as Commentator-Judge. The two attorneys who first registered for the course, Everett B. Laybourne and Richard Sprague, represented the plaintiff and defendant, respectively. A jury of Bar members was called and the case got under way exactly as if it were an actual trial.

After a two hours' session of the moot court, the case was continued to March 14, when it was resumed in the Edison Building auditorium, with Allen W. Ashburn, President of the Los Angeles Bar Association, as Commentator-Judge, and Attorneys Jack W. Hardy for plaintiff and Kenneth Chantry for the defendant, taking up the trial proceedings where the preceding attorneys left off. The attendance was large—about the same as at the first session.

The testimony of a number of witnesses and the documentary evidence was designed to raise points calling for frequent comment and rulings by the Commentator-Judge. There was no cross-examination of the witnesses at the first two sessions, as the third session will be given up entirely to this phase of the trial. Other counsel for the parties to the action and different Commentator-Judges will preside at the third and fourth sessions on March 21 and March 28.

No activity of the Bar Association heretofore has aroused so much interest among the members, both old and young. The cost of the experiment is defrayed by the Association's charge of $5.00 to members and $10.00 to non-members. For single sessions the charge is $1.25. The entire course is made available for all the lawyers of the county.

It is probable that the unqualified success of the experiment will justify further activity of this kind by the Association.

Professional Indifference

IT IS natural that lawyers should argue—and disagree; just as it is natural for animals to fight. The same motive of individual self-preservation obtains.

But even animals will make common cause and cooperate against a common offensive. Surely, any group of reasonable human beings should not hesitate to combine for their own collective good. No one will deny that concerted action, whether it be business, political or professional, is far more effective than individual, or groups of individuals, working to the same ends.

It is pretty definitely established that the bar, everywhere, is faced with grave problems—problems that cannot be finally solved without unified action. Individualism is a commendable attribute of character. It is a quality of mind that enables many to overcome all sorts of handicaps; but boastful independence of action—the lone wolf attitude—in all matters, personal and professional, is carrying individualism to extremes.

All of this leads to the complaint that many members of the bar —probably half of them—are utterly indifferent to the earnest efforts and laudible aims of the bar association—state and local. They do not seem either to understand or recognize the fundamental fact that these professional groups do not function solely for the benefit of those who do the work and keep them alive, but for the general good of the entire bar membership, as well as the public interests. Even the most casual consideration of the subject should demonstrate the truth of that statement.

Bar associations exist solely for the enforcement of the standards and ideals of the profession, and for the benefit of society in general. There are some persons of iconoclastic minds, or for some other reason, who will sneer at this declaration of ideals. But it is true, nevertheless. It would be sad if it were otherwise.

In Los Angeles county there is one of the largest bar associations in the country. Moreover, there are several other organized groups of lawyers. Also, there are more persons licensed to practice law residing in the county than in any other county, with perhaps three exceptions. But even if we include the membership of all of these groups, the fact remains that less than half of the lawyers of the county are members of local bar groups, or take the slightest interest in bar problems and activities.

How to arouse the interest and cooperation of this indifferent half is our problem. Our own association's services to members are many and outstanding. We have enumerated them before and shall do so again from time to time. Perhaps constant repetition of the broader benefits of bar membership will produce a change in those who stand critically aloof.

FUTURE OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY LAW LIBRARY

By Thomas S. Dabagh, Librarian.

BEFORE proceeding to discuss the subject of this paper, I would like to express my appreciation of the cordial welcome which I have received as the successor of the beloved Tom Robinson. Knowing the esteem in which Mr. Robinson was held, it seemed likely to me that I would be received with some reserve by the Los Angeles Bar and the library staff. On the contrary, all have been most cordial and co-operative, and I have been made to feel that the memory of Tom Robinson is really a blessing upon his successor.

Of course, the policies of the administration of the Los Angeles County Law Library are determined by its Board of Trustees, of which Judge Frank G. Finlayson is President. The plans of the Librarian, and all expenditures made by him, are subject to the approval of the Board. In discussing the future of the Law Library, therefore, the Librarian can only "think out aloud," as it were, and his thoughts should not be regarded as committing the Board to any policy or plan.

It is obviously impossible to project a detailed plan for the Law Library for years to come, after only a few days acquaintanceship with its traditions, staff, and collection, and with the judiciary and bar which it serves. However, certain fundamentals points appear to be clear, and it is these which I propose to discuss.

First, it seems clear that there is no call for revolutionary changes. It would be relatively easy to create a large disturbance in the arrangements of the library, and to promote a considerable fanfare regarding minor readjustments. After all, however, the library has served its patrons reasonably well in the past, and it is altogether fitting that such readjustments as are made be accomplished quietly, to win approval on their own merits, and that changes in arrangements and facilities be made only after careful consideration and planning, to conserve established values as much as possible.

Second, it appears that instead of rigidly adhering to a fixed program, the proper attitude for the Librarian to assume is that of a readiness to face problems as they arise, and to co-operate with all concerned to secure a solution as mutually satisfactory as possible. A growing law library, in a developing community, cannot have a too set and rigid plan of administration. The library must expand, shift emphasis, extend facilities, and be reasonably flexible to adapt itself to changing needs, in order properly to serve the community.

Next, it seems that the Law Library has now reached a point where utilization of its current resources should be emphasized, rather than the observation of such resources for future utilization. Oviously, this is not intended to suggest that expenditures should be anything but economical, nor should preservation of materials for use by generations to come be overlooked. However, consistently with these important considerations, a definite effort should be made to make the collection as widely and easily available as possible, and to develop the collection still further.

Although the Los Angeles County Law Library probably has the most important collection of law books in the West, there is need for a systematic completion of its holdings, old and recent. Lawyers are prone to make a distinction

between a "working library", and a "research library". This distinction tends to obscure the fact that the best law library for the practicing attorney as well as for the legal scholar is the library that has the most materials for a thorough search for precedent and authority. The "working library" must be satisfactory and immediately to hand, of course, but the "research library" must also be complete and reasonably available. Probably only law librarians realize how frequently attorneys are forced to refer to old text books, for example, to find authority on obscure points, and to verify citations in old cases.

Of course, many important old books cannot be procured as originally published, or can be procured only at prohibitive prices. In lieu of these originals, modern methods of reproduction make it possible to secure exact photographic copies at small cost. The most recent development of this kind is microfilm reproduction, which can bring tiny film copies of priceless manuscripts to the library, for reading in a machine, at a cost of about a cent a page, if labor costs are shared by co-operating libraries.

As for newly published law books, every effort should be made to make certain that a copy of every volume of any value is added to the law library collection, except where the price is so high as to be out of proportion to the value of the book to the Library.

To make the collection fully available, proper catalogs must be prepared and maintained. As an immediate project, a "short catalog" is planned, to list only the important recent works in the Library, on the more active subjects. A thorough catalog, with full bibliographic entries, should be compiled as soon as possible, to reveal the resources of the Library in their entirety. Until this is done, research in the law library, whether by the practicing attorney or the legal scholar, will be greatly handicapped.

The judiciary and bar of Los Angeles County deserve to have at their disposal a splendid law library. It is probably true that they have at present the best collection of law books in the West. In the not very distant future I hope that it can be truthfully said that they have one of the best law libraries in the country.

PREVENTION OF HUMAN OBSOLESCENCE

By Frank G. Tyrrell, Judge of Municipal Court

THE comment on this subject in the February, 1939, BAR BULLETIN, is wise and timely. There is a way to prevent it, which if available, ought to be followed, namely, work! But what shall be done when the worker is rejected because of inability, real or supposed, to keep the pace set by the machine? Manual dexterity and speed may be impaired by advancing years; but not so, with regard to mental efficiency. Indeed, there is a sort of momentum in mental processes, gained by years and experience, which is a real asset in the work prescribed.

As to the machine worker, it is hard to improve on the dictum of Chief Justice Hughes,—"Industry must take care of its human wastage." The most humane as well as the most economical way to do this would be to set the aged worker at some lighter task, even on reduced pay, wherever that is practicable. When chattel slavery was in vogue, that was the rule on many a plantation with the aging slave. Even when there is no such lighter task in the particular industry, the worker, if he exercises his initiative, may find some work fitted to his waning physical powers, and ought to be encouraged so to do.

It was a favorite saying with Elbert Hubbard, sage of East Aurora, and editor *The Philistine,* "Work is for the worker." A man who can carry on should do so, for his own health and happiness, and to escape becoming a burden to others. This should be the uniform desire and purpose of every American. A pioneer mother and grandmother, coming to California in a covered wagon, fell ill in her old age, and was bedfast. She murmured against it, and said heroically,—"I have always prayed that I might not live to be a burden to my children." Neither should any person be content to live to be a burden to the community.

The current number of "Officials on Parade" comes to hand as these lines are written, quoting a decision by Judge Collins on a law disqualifying a man who had reached fifty, from the job of porter. "To assert that an applicant of fifty is physically unfit to perform the duties of a porter merely because he has attained that age, is to assert an obvious absurdity. . . . Economics and humanity condemn the rule; nothing that is reasonable or right favors it." That judgment reflects common sense. If workers generally could be brought to realize that they will live longer and find life more prolific of happiness if they continue their useful activities, the State would be spared a tremendous burden, and society be in every way the gainer.

After all, "The mind's the measure of the man." If, one allows his mind to lie fallow, refusing hospitality to new ideas, new knowledge, and new interests, he is already dead, but like the Irishman's turtle, is unconscious of it! Leaders of industry could perform no more valued social service than to spread this teaching among their workers.

Los Angeles Bar Association

MONTHLY DINNER MEETING

UNIVERSITY CLUB

March 23, 1939 . . . . . 6:30 P.M.

★ ★

***Guest Speaker* . . . . .**

CLARK SELLERS

Nationally Known Handwriting Expert

Mr. Sellers will present an illustrated lecture upon the subject of hand-writing and questioned documents. This lecture will have several novel and exceptionally interesting features.

★ ★

WILLIAM TABOR

Baritone—Singer Extraordinary

COURTESY OF WARNER BROS.

★ ★

As this is President Ashburn's first monthly meeting—let us assure him by our presence that we are "for him" and that we enjoy these monthly "get togethers."

Dinner—*$1.50 per plate*

Informal ***Guests welcome***

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

HANDWRITING OF SHAKESPEARE

By Clark Sellers*

ON account of the known value of William Shakespeare's signature many attempts have been made to forge it. While in London recently I had an opportunity to examine some of these forgeries and to compare them with known genuine signatures of Shakespeare.

The three top signatures are signed to the three sheets of Shakespeare's Will, executed in 1616, one month before his death. They are now somewhat worn and indistinct. The third one, signed to the last page, reads: "By me William Shakespeare".

(The other three known genuine signatures of Shakespeare, not shown here, were signed respectively to a Deposition dated May 11, 1612, in the case of Bellott v. Montjoy; to a Purchase-Deed dated March 10, 1613; and to a Mortgage-Deed dated March 11, 1613.)

In the above photograph the fourth signature from the top is the one found in an autograph collection in the Stanford University Library.

The bottom photograph is of the signature found in a library in Utah.

*Examiner of Questioned Documents, Los Angeles.

Signatures have been found in different parts of the world purportedly signed by the great bard. Some of these are written on pieces of paper containing no other handwriting. All other handwriting, if there ever was any, was removed by cutting that portion of the paper away. Most of these signatures written on trimmed pieces of paper are more legible and better penmanship than any of the known genuine signatures of Shakespeare.

There have been a few purported Shakespeare signatures found in the United States. Not long ago one was found in an autograph collection acquired by the Library of Stanford University. The paper bearing this signature had been cut from a larger piece of paper, and was in a collection of signatures of famous persons. More recently another somewhat similar signature was found pasted in an old book in a library in Utah. It, too, was on a cut piece of paper, which was trimmed to approximately two inches by eight inches. The question naturally arises about such signatures, "Did Shakespeare write them?"

Specimens of Shakespeare's signature that may be used as exemplars with any degree of certainty as to their genuineness are very limited. There are only six known genuine signatures of Shakespeare in existence. These are signed to legal documents.

THE IRELAND HOAX.

William Henry Ireland, an English lad of a mere eighteen years, attempted in 1795 to cure this dearth of Shakespeare handwriting. He paid the sum of five shillings to a bookseller named Verey, in St. Martin's Lane, London, who allowed Ireland to take the fly-leaves from books known to have been printed during Shakespeare's lifetime. (In this he was more sagacious than many a modern forger who grabs the first paper that is handy, without any thought as to whether or not the document he fabricates is dated back beyond the actual date of the manufacture of the paper.)

Ireland procured a bookmaker to concoct a mixture of inks which would look old on paper. When first written this ink was very pale, but he discovered that by holding it to the fire the writing became more legible, and turned a brownish color giving it the visual appearance of great age. Armed with this equipment Ireland began to practice imitating handwriting of the Shakespeare time, being fortified by the knowledge that there were no manuscripts known to be written by Shakespeare which could be used for comparison purposes. He did know that there were a very few of Shakespeare's signatures in existence, which he practiced imitating.

Young Ireland then began to "find" writings of Shakespeare, including a love-letter and a poem from Willie Shakespeare to Ann Hathaway; a religious Profession of Faith; complete manuscript of King Lear and part of Hamlet; a letter from Queen Elizabeth complimenting Shakespeare on his writings; and finally an entirely new Shakespeare play entitled "Vortigern and Rowena."

The "finding" of these papers allegedly written by the immortal bard caused a national furore. Many of the literary elect of that time were duped by them. Even the great Boswell, after examining some of the fabricated manuscripts, knelt before them and exclaimed, "I now kiss the invaluable relics of our bard, and thanks to God that I lived to see them." Twenty-one literary men of the day signed a testimonial that the documents were genuine Shakespeare papers. This testimonial later was referred to as the "register of shame."

MALONE'S ANALYSIS.

Edmond Malone, perhaps the most able critic of the time, was a disbeliever in the authenticity of the documents from the very beginning. He made a thorough analysis of many of these alleged Shakespeare documents, and in 1796 published a book of more than four hundred pages in which he pointed out unmistakable evidence that the documents were forgeries. He showed that many of the words were not spelled as they were during Shakespeare's time. He called attention to the frequent use of words which were not consistent with that era, as many of the words used were known to have first come into existence long after Shakespeare's time. He observed that the documents were written on a wide assortment of paper. One manuscript alone was written on sheets of paper containing more than twenty different kinds of watermarks. This indicated to Malone that the paper had been collected from various sources, and he hit the nail on the head by pointing out that such paper could be obtained by cutting fly-leaves from old books. Last but not least, Malone pointed out the defects in the handwriting. A notation was written on the purported letter from Queen Elizabeth to Shakespeare. This notation was supposedly written by Shakespeare, stating he had received this letter from the Queen and that care should be taken to preserve it. Fortunately there were genuine specimens of the handwriting of Queen Elizabeth available for comparison purposes, and Malone pointed out two important facts which were compelling evidence that the newly discovered writings were fabrications; namely, that the letter purportedly from Queen Elizabeth was not written by her, and that the same person who wrote the Queen Elizabeth letter also wrote all of the newly discovered Shakespeare documents.

In speaking of the literary men of the period who had innocently upheld the genuineness of these documents, Malone said that if these gentlemen had modestly and ingenuously said that they had too hastily given a judgment on a matter which they did not understand, that they knew nothing of old handwriting, and nothing of old language, he should have compassion on them, but since they clung to opinions they were unable to maintain and unwilling to retract, he thought they should be made public examples.

The vigorous attacks by Malone and others caused Ireland to confess his hoax, and in 1805 Ireland published a book detailing how he fabricated the documents and recounted the thrills he received in having them pronounced genuine by some of the big-wigs of the day.

I examined some of these Ireland forgeries in the manuscript department of the British Museum. The papers are today brittle and discolored from the scorching received when young Ireland toasted them before the fire to give them the appearance of age. They are not particularly clever imitations.

In discussing the Ireland forgeries J. A. Farrer in his book "Literary Forgeries" injects an interesting viewpoint into this subject. He states:

> "The story of the Ireland forgeries raises several reflections. For here were documents fabricated by a mere boy, of no special learning or

education, and, instead of being in any way concealed, exposed most openly to publicity and criticism; yet in an age of learning they deceived many of the very elect of the learned world. What then may not have been possible in the line of forgery in the times when a forger had no publicity, no scrutiny, no printed version of his fabrications to reckon with? The possibilities were simply limitless, and almost justify the scepticism of Hardouin, the Jesuit, who held that most of the Greek and Latin classics were the works of the monks in the middle ages. . . .

"Questions of style and spelling apart, the believers in the forgeries had a stronger main argument than their opponents: it was far more likely that the papers were genuine than that any individual could have had time or motive sufficient to forge them. Yet they were forged in a very short time, by a very simple process, and by a youth of no experience in literature. If ever there was an incident calculated to inspire learning with a perception of the wisdom of sobriety and modesty of judgment in matters literary, and of an absence of dogmatism, it was the case of this lad who for his own sport carried such unspeakable havoc into the camp of the learned."

In addition to some of the Shakespeare forgeries there are in the British Museum many curious literary forgeries, including imitated writings of Byron and of Shelley. However, fabrications are by no means limited to handwritings, as valuable "first editions" have now been exposed as spurious. These include alleged first editions of some of the writings of Tennyson, Browning, Ruskin, Thackeray, and others.

The exposures of the publications as being fabrications were made possible by establishing that the paper on which some of them were printed contained fibers that were not used in the manufacture of paper until after the dates printed on the publications. In other instances the design of type used in the printing had not yet been invented on the alleged date of printing.

There is no doubt about the great value of genuine works of the masters of the past. But it is certain that we should proceed slowly in purchasing at fancy prices old autographs or first editions. In no other field is the old saying more true: "Things are not always what they seem."

CHARLES SHARITT, LOS ANGELES ATTORNEY, CHOSEN STATE BAR JOURNAL EDITOR

CHARLES E. SHARRITT, one of the younger members of the Los Angeles Bar Association, formerly a member of the Bulletin Committee, has been chosen by the Board of Governors as secretary of the Committee on State Bar Activities (formerly Public Relations Committee) and took up his duties at San Francisco March 15. Mr. Sharritt will edit the State Bar Journal, under the supervision of the Board of Governors, and perform other duties in the work of coordinating the activities of the committees.

Mr. Sharritt was a Los Angeles newspaperman prior to entering upon the practice of law.

COMPENSATION OF LOS ANGELES MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES

The following information, obtained from the official reports for the last available accounting period from each of the courts listed, shows the salaries paid to municipal court judges in major cities:

SALARIES PAID

Detroit, Michigan	$12,500.00
New York City, New York	10,840.00
Chicago, Illinois	10,000.00
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	10,000.00
Boston, Massachusetts	9,000.00
Cleveland, Ohio	9,000.00
San Francisco, California	7,500.00
Los Angeles, California	6,500.00

COMPARATIVE EFFICIENCY OF MUNICIPAL COURTS

City	No. of Judges	Cases Per Judge Per Year
Los Angeles	30	11,205
San Francisco	12	10,152
Cleveland	16	7,160
New York	68	4,527
Boston	15	4,226
Philadelphia	11	3,517
Detroit	10	1,991

Analysis of the foregoing figures discloses that although Los Angeles Municipal Court judges annually dispose of 83.3 per cent more cases per judge than the average of all similar courts, the average salary paid to the judges of such courts is 44.8 per cent higher than that paid to Los Angeles judges.

The Los Angeles Municipal Court came into existence as a result of a constitutional amendment in 1926, at which time its jurisdiction in civil cases was limited to $1,000.00, and the salary of the judges fixed at $6,000.00. In 1929 the civil jurisdiction was increased to $2,000.00 and the salaries of the judges raised to $7,500.00 per annum. During the depression year of 1933, as an emergency measure, the salaries of Los Angeles and Long Beach municipal judges were reduced to $6,500.00. No reduction was made in the salaries of the municipal judges of San Francisco, who have received $7,500.00 per annum throughout the entire depression.

In 1937, by what was almost the unanimous vote of both houses of the Legislature, a bill was passed to restore Los Angeles Municipal Court salaries to the former level, but was vetoed by former Governor Merriam.

This action upon the part of the Governor was somewhat surprising, inasmuch as the bill had been sponsored by almost the entire Los Angeles County delegation in the State Legislature, and was purely a local measure in which the State was in no way concerned.

REVENUE

The total revenue received by the Los Angeles Municipal Court for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, derived from filing fees, bail forfeitures, criminal fines, and other sources of revenue, was $1,481,189.00. The total cost of operating the court during the same period was $592,374.06, showing a net operating profit of $888,814.94.

Through increased efficiency and voluntary economies, the court reduced its expenditures during the fiscal year to an amount $36,993.94 less than its appropriated budget, and returned this sum to the taxpayers. It is an interesting coincidence that this voluntary saving upon the part of the court exceeds by nearly $7,000.00, the annual amount required to restore the salaries of Los Angeles judges to the former level.

COMPARISON OF COUNTY SALARIES

Municipal courts are in fact county courts, having county-wide jurisdiction in many cases. The salaries of its judges and attaches are paid by the county, and therefore, the following comparison of county salaries is interesting:

County Auditor	$10,000.00
County Treasurer	10,000.00
County Counsel	10,000.00
Flood Control Engineer	10,000.00
County Assessor	9,000.00
District Attorney	9,000.00
Sheriff	9,000.00
Superintendent of Schools	9,000.00
Superintendent of Charities	8,500.00
Assistant Superintendent of Charities	8,000.00
Chief Deputy District Attorney	7,500.00
One Deputy District Attorney	7,500.00
Three Deputy District Attorneys (each)	7,200.00
Assistant County Counsel	7,500.00
Chief Deputy County Counsel	7,500.00
Flood Control Counsel	7,500.00
Two Deputy County Counsel (each)	7,200.00
Public Defender	7,200.00
County Surveyor	7,200.00
County Clerk	7,200.00
Coroner	7,200.00
Recorder	7,200.00
County Forester	7,200.00
Health Officer	7,200.00
Road Commissioner	7,200.00
Law Librarian	7,200.00
Chief Mechanical Engineer	7,200.00
Secretary to Superior Court	7,200.00
MUNICIPAL COURT JUDGES	6,500.00

Experience has proven that the Los Angeles Municipal Court is considered as a training ground for Superior Court judges. Since the establishment of the Municipal Court in 1926, approximately eighty-five per cent of appointees to the Los Angeles Superior Court have been Municipal judges. Twenty-three of the present fifty Superior judges were appointed or elected directly to that court from the Municipal Court. One former Municipal judge, after a comparatively short period upon the Superior bench, was appointed to, and is now serving, upon the Supreme Court of the State.

It is reasonable to believe that the efficiency as well as the integrity of the courts has a direct relation to the compensation paid. There are no pensions for Municipal judges in California, and no security of tenure. After abandoning his law practice and giving perhaps the best years of his life, a judge may be turned into the street by some unexpected turn of politics. Without private income his accumulation will be small, if any, at present salaries. It is reasonable to believe that the judicial mind cannot function efficiently when clouded by financial worry, nor can it function impartially when under obligation to special interests for financial assistance.

JUNIOR BARRISTER'S 1938 CHAIRMAN REPORTS TO TRUSTEES

By Joseph McFarland

The officers of the Junior Barristers for the year 1938 were:

W. Joseph McFarland	Chairman
Ford W. Harris, Jr.	First Vice Chairman
Richard A. Von Hagen	Second Vice Chairman
George B. Gose	Secretary-Treasurer

The officers were assisted by an Executive Council of thirty regular members of whom fifteen had never served before. Four affiliate members served on the Council, each representing a local affiliated Bar Association.

The activities of the Council were inaugurated by a first "get-together" evening at the Rosslyn Hotel. Regular monthly Breakfast meetings were held at the Stock Exchange Club, and the final meeting of the Council was the Annual Dinner Dance held at the Jonathan Club.

The affairs of the Junior Barristers for the past year were highlighted by such occasions as the Spring Frolic held in the Spring; a Reception and Dinner for incoming lawyers at the Elks Club in June; the Doctors and Lawyers Dinner in October; Judges' Night in December, on the occasion of which there was held

a reception for the incoming lawyers; the Christmas Hi-Jinx and the General Election in February.

On the occasion of admission of candidates to the Bar in June and December, the Chairman of the Junior Barristers appeared before the Supreme Court sitting in Los Angeles and addressed the newly admitted lawyers.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

Following the practice of the previous year at the beginning of the year a questionnaire was mailed to all members of the Junior Barristers. The replies to the questionnaires were of great assistance in the selection of committee members.

The affairs and activities for the year were managed by seventeen standing committees and certain special committees which were appointed as the occasion demanded during the year. Approximately 125 Junior Barristers served on one or more committees during the year. With one or two exceptions each committee was chairmaned by a member of the Executive Council.

Some of the more important committees and their activities are as follows:

Bar Bulletin Index Committee

This committee under the chairmanship of George Lindeloff, Jr. was given the responsibility of completing the work of indexing the published volumes of the Bar Bulletin. This project has practically been completed.

Calendar Committee

The need for this committee was suggested by reason of past experience wherein, on several occasions, there were serious conflicts in the activities between the Junior Bar, Senior Bar and other organizations. This committee functioned somewhat as a clearing-house for determining the available dates on which to hold Junior Barristers' affairs. C. Hudson Cox was Chairman.

Christmas Hi-Jinx

During the past years the Junior Barristers have been privileged to conduct one of the regular monthly meetings of the Los Angeles Bar. This year the Junior Barristers were requested to conduct the Annual Christmas Hi-Jinx party of the Los Angeles Bar Association. Robert E. Ford, Chairman of the Committee, and Everett B. Laybourne, Vice-Chairman, Kenneth Chantry and other members of the committee deserve credit for the excellent manner in which this program was handled.

Committee on Coordination of the American Bar Association

Under the leadership of Harold W. Schweitzer, Chairman, this Committee among other accomplishments was successful in securing the affiliation of the Junior Barristers with the Junior Bar Conference of the American Bar Association which entitles the Junior Barristers to two official delegates to the Association's Annual Convention.

Committee on Coordination of Local Affiliated Associations

This Committee served to interest the younger members of affiliated associations in taking part in the activities of the Junior Barristers. Louis E. Sterry was Chairman.

Committee on Coordination of State Bar

The work of this Committee was particularly active in connection with the State Bar Convention in Pasadena at which the Junior Barristers acted as hosts to the out-of-town young lawyers, arranged a cocktail party and tea for the ladies. The Committee was also active in the work of the Junior Bar Conference.

Doctors and Lawyers' Dinner Committee

This Committee headed by Lawrence E. Drumm successfully presented the annual Doctors and Lawyers' party held at the Los Angeles Breakfast Club. Approximately two hundred doctors and lawyers were in attendance and witnessed a play presented by a cast selected from the two professional groups.

Educational Information Committee

This Committee under the leadership of Arthur C. Hurt, Jr., Chairman, has been working in cooperation with practicing attorneys and teachers of law in gathering material to recommend a pre-legal curriculum. The Committee has also given talks to high school students on the problems of lawyers with a view of encouraging the fit to enter the profession and to discourage the unfit.

Judges' Night Committee

This Committee under Douglas C. Gregg, Chairman, had charge of the bi-annual party of the Junior Barristers known as "Judges Night", which is held for the purpose of giving the members of the Junior Barristers an opportunity to meet the Judges and to have the Judges of our courts become acquainted with the young lawyers. This year's party was held at the University Club and there were in attendance approximately 65 Judges from the State and Federal Courts. There were also present, as guests, approximately 65 newly admitted lawyers. Dr. Paul Mason of the California Institute of Technology was the principal speaker of the evening, and President Frank B. Belcher gave an address directed particularly to the new members of the Bar.

Juvenile Crime Prevention Committee

This Committee has devoted its work to a study of juvenile crime, and, in this connection, has worked in close cooperation with the Juvenile Court. Speakers were furnished to schools and other bodies and they endeavored to stimulate interest in the elimination of juvenile crime. Harold H. Krowech was General Chairman of the Committee which was divided into three sections as follows: Research Section,—Jesse A. Hamilton, Chairman; Public Information Section,—Spencer C. Olin, Chairman; and Safety Council Section,—William James Lane, Chairman.

As an indication of the success of the work of this Committee, it should be noted that its program of Juvenile Crime Prevention has been accepted by the American Bar Association and Junior Bar Conference of California.

Legal Aid Committee

This Committee, under the leadership of Maurice J. Hinden, Chairman, continued work started several years ago of assisting in the work of the Legal Aid Clinics.

Membership Committee

In addition to its routine membership work, this Committee instituted the plan of holding two receptions for the newly admitted lawyers, one being held in December at the Elks Club and the other on the occasion of "Judge's Night", held at the University Club. These two events afforded an opportunity for mutual acquaintanceship and served to acquaint the new lawyers with the activities of the Junior Barristers and of the Los Angeles Bar Association. Calvin Helgoe was Chairman of the Committee.

Negligence Cases Committee

This Committee under the leadership of Jack Kotler rendered service of a confidential nature in cooperation with the work of the State Bar Committee on "ambulance chasing" matters.

Night and Sunrise Courts Committee

As a result of the report of this Committee based upon its study and research on the conduct of the two courts at Lincoln Heights, steps have been taken to enact legislation which will do away with the present mandatory provisions of the law requiring that Night and Sunrise Courts be held at Lincoln Heights. William F. Hall acted as Chairman of the Committee.

Publicity and Program Announcements Committee

This Committee headed by T. H. Sword, Chairman, was charged with the responsibility of giving proper publicity throughout the year to the various activities of the Junior Barristers in various publications.

Research and Information Committee

This Committee has rendered valuable assistance to the Los Angeles Bar Association in connection with certain phases of its work. The Committee is presently accumulating material for the American Bar Association's Committee on Public Relations. Jay J. Stein served as Chairman of the Committee.

Speakers Committee

Under the leadership of Wm. Thomas Davis, Chairman, this Committee has sponsored a weekly radio program (Saturday night) over Station KFAC on legal subjects of general public interest. The Committee has also furnished speakers to meetings of the Chamber of Commerce and other civic groups.

Spring Frolic Committee

This Committee under the leadership of Harold W. Schweitzer, Chairman, conducted the annual Spring Frolic. In addition to the customary sports and other entertainment, this year's party had the feature of celebrating the Tenth Anniversary of the founding of the Junior Barristers. The guest of honor was Hubert T. Morrow, the founder of the organization and an individual who has continued his interest and support of the group throughout its existence.

OTHER WORK

The foregoing presents the highlights of the activities during the year of some of the more active committees. The work of the members of all committees has been efficiently and well performed, and the Chairman of the Junior Barristers desires to express his gratitude for the loyal support of the members of the organization.

Steps have recently been taken to set up machinery for a placement bureau for young lawyers, to be supervised by a committee of the Junior Barristers. It is believed that a valuable service can be rendered through such activity, and that the idea should soon become a reality.

The Junior Barristers were counseled and assisted throughout the year by three able and interested advisers, Hubert T. Morrow, Allen W. Ashburn and Herbert Freston.

Reputation should not be measured by or depend upon manipulated publicity.

BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS OF ENGLAND

In the February Bulletin there appeared an interesting article on The Judiciary in Britain, by Florance M. Guedalla, prominent Solicitor of London. In this article Mr. Guedalla discusses the functions of the Barrister and the Solicitor under the English system.

THE right of practising as Counsel in England and Wales (commonly called "England") in public in the High Court of Justice and in the House of Lords is reserved to Barristers, that is, those who have been "called to the Bar" by one of the four Inns of Court, namely, Lincoln's Inn, Inner Temple, Middle Temple and Gray's Inn. Solicitors can appear for clients in Chambers (*i. e.*, not in public) in the High Court of Justice, and in the inferior courts, including county courts and before magistrates.

I am not now dealing with the constitution of the Inns, nor the history of how this practice came about, except to point out that in the days of our Saxon and Norman Kings, practically the only persons who were scholars were the Roman Catholic priests and they used to take up cases because of their learning, and, being priests, they charged the lay client nothing. The priests wore robes, as later on early Tudor days the gentry wore gowns, represented today by the gowns of Barristers and Judges, and when Barristers, like other gentlemen in England in the Eighteenth Century, wore wigs, the practice of wearing wigs had also been perpetuated.

Towards the end of the Plantagenet and at the beginning of the Tudor days there were persons in London who got called "solicitors." They were people who used to solicit legal business from the lay client, usually to put same into the hands of Counsel. It was not expected of the solicitor that he should know much about law but he ought to know something about practice in and outside the Courts. Simultaneously another class of person arose, who got called "Attorney." A country client left his legal affairs, especially if it was a question of litigation, in the hands of an Attorney, who often was the self-same person as the solicitor, but Counsel themselves never were solicitors or attorneys.

It gradually became the practice that only Counsel could appear in public before a Judge and that is why the two branches of our profession get so sharply divided. In one class springs solicitors and attorneys, which today have to pass a longer apprenticeship and undergo a more severe examination to become solicitors than is the case with Barristers. On the other hand, Counsel, in this country, have never been entitled and are not entitled today to the receipt of any fees.

One of the things which is now complained of by solicitors is, if a Bill of Costs is taxed, that the lay client can see a solicitor or his clerk for 6/8d. and engage his attention for one hour for that price, and in great firms of solicitors who employ many people, a solicitor is entitled to charge on behalf of his firm for the attendance of a clerk the self-same 6/8d. No distinction is made in taxation of costs between the services of the eldest or most experienced or most learned or most specialized solicitor and the veriest and most ignorant tyro or his clerk. The word "clerk" is also of ecclesiastical origin, meaning "clericus"; a person who can read.

At a time when there was no clear recognition of Counsel, that is, a time before the Reformation, the King's chief legal adviser was often called "Attorney

General" and to this day the adviser to the Government, although not to the King personally, is His Majesty's Attorney-General, and the second legal adviser is His Majesty's Solicitor-General. The word "General" was a military title, denoting the greatness of the legal adviser and advocate. But "Attorney" and "Solicitor" were titles taken from the lower degrees of the legal profession. Solicitors and Attorneys had no right of audience before Judges in public but interviewed the lay client.

There also cropped up in Plantagenet and Tudor days another great order amongst Counsel; because of the work they did they were called "servientes" which got translated to the word "Sergeant", "Sergeants" were lawyers in those old Plantagenet and Tudor days both in this country and in France. As they had precedence of the ordinary Barrister, Sergeants became Counsel of great dignity, but in early Tudor days, and about the same period in France, the word "sergeant" was also applied to a military rank. There was a captain of a company of soldiers but under him was his sergeant, a "servient". Later on there was interposed a lieutenant.

By the time of Queen Elizabeth it got established that her Attorney added to his name the military title of "General" and so did the Solicitor and these two Counsel, to this day, remain Attorney-General and Solicitor-General. They hold office, which is a political office, attached to the members of the Government of the day and these two are the heads of the Bar for the time being.

The sergeants became a very close corporation, electing Counsel to be its members known as Sergeants Inn, where they resided and practiced. In the Eighteenth Century it was decided to create another category of Counsel holding

precedence over ordinary Counsel, but inferior to the Sergeants, and they were called King's Counsel or, in the case of Queen Victoria, Queen's Counsel.

King's Counsel were and are selected and appointed by the Lord Chancellor of the day.

In this practical country it has always been considered that the best tuition is to teach oneself. At Rugby, for instance, where I was educated, on two days a week there were five lessons and on the other week days only three and sometimes only two lessons. Out of school hours one could teach oneself in one's study, for instance, in the School House where I was, as much or as little as one liked, and one could consult one's special tutor about the subject-matter of studies or one need not consult him. So it is that a pupil at the Bar can work as much or as little as he chooses.

No Barrister (and he must be a "junior" barrister, not a King's Counsel) can have more than two pupils at a time, nor may he charge more than 100 guineas premium to any pupil for working in his Chambers.. If one means to be a success at the Bar one tries to get into the Chambers of a busy "junior" Barrister, so that one can attend his conferences and read all his papers and follow him into Court.

Of the 300 or 400 successful practising Barristers, whether juniors or King's Counsel, this has been their career. With regard to the other pupils, they really never did intend to practice at the Bar but only to learn enough law to go back to their well-to-do homes in the country where, in due course, they would become unpaid Magistrates. Or some young men are sent to the Bar to get a smattering of law before being put into business; if their parents occupy big business positions it is considered worthwhile that the son should know something about legal procedure and some elementary principles of law. Others realize in time that they will never get much work as Barristers and go into other vocations.

Before one can be called to the Bar one must have spent three years at the Inn eating a certain number of dinners per legal term. In the same way, when I was at Balliol College, at Oxford, one could not make progress towards getting a Degree unless one had eaten so many dinners in Balliol Hall per term. And just as at University, there are examinations, so, at the Bar, there are examinations. The four Inns of Court have combined. Forty-four years ago, when I started in the profession to become a Solicitor, examinations for the Bar were very light. Gradually they have become stiffer, and Barristers are required to have a pretty sound knowledge of history of their country, constitutional law, civil law and the ordinary working branches of our law, as well as procedure in the various Courts, and unless they have passed the examination the Inn does not call them to the Bar. In their last year, they become "pupils."

Needless to say the Benchers of the Inn do not call one to the Bar unless the person concerned is supposed to be a man of integrity and is vouched for by a member of the Bar. Also he has to pay a substantial fee before being admitted

to the Bar, but curiously enough the Bar has never required the person to be admitted to it necessarily to be a British subject.

It is for that reason that many distinguished American Counsel have become members of one of our Inns and admitted to the Bar. Sometimes without having to pass an examination, and also many distinguished Counsel in different countries on the continent have sought or been given the privilege. If the Inn has admitted a man to be a Member of the Bar, he is entitled to practice in our Law Courts.

If a Solicitor wanted to give up his side of the profession and become a Barrister, he would have to undergo this course of three years, plus the examination. In the same way, if a Barrister wants to become a Solicitor, it will take him at least three years and he has to pay the fees required by the Law Society and Government.

As a matter of fact, it costs more money to become a Solicitor. Normally one has to be articled to a Solicitor for five years, but if one has University qualifications, the period is reduced to three years, and so it would be in the case of a Barrister wishing to become a Solicitor.

The examinations to become a Solicitor are, and for many years have been much stiffer, because a lay client sees the Solicitor and does not see the Barrister; at least he has to see the Solicitor first of all and the Solicitor therefore ought to have a general knowledge of the law. In the case of a Barrister, it is not expected, after he has passed the examination of his Inn, that he shall have a general knowledge of the law, because the Solicitor selects a Barrister who specialises in the particular type of case required. For instance, a Barrister who practises in Admiralty work is not expected to know any other law, and so with regard to divorce, or probate or patents or bankruptcy.

There are certain Barristers who only work in Company Law; there are others who work in different branches of equity in the Chancery Courts; there is even a special class of barrister who is adept at conveyancing and drawing documents relating to real estate, wills and settlements; then of course, there is the kind of barrister who is a great advocate in Court but would not be expected to be familiar with all branches of common law or of statutes; for instance, there is a limited Bar which has a great knowledge of income tax or death duties; there are lawyers who are learned on highly technical subjects such as frustration and certain forms of breach of contract. There are the famous practitioners of the "criminal" bar. There are Barristers who get consulted solely about commercial cases; our commercial Courts form a part of the King's Bench Division; indeed Barristers who practise in the commercial Court are usually the highest paid in our High Courts of Justice, with the except that now and then some special kind of advocate conducts a very important case, a cause celebre, or complicated case commanding high fees.

There are Barristers who make a specialty (they are called Parliamentary Counsel) of practising before the Committees in the House of Lords or House

of Commons, usually in connection with Railway Bills, Gas Bills, Water Bills, Electricity and Power Bills and such like matters; also there are many so-called private bills before Parliament which may regulate the distribution and inheritance of a very conflicting estate; Parliamentary Counsel practise in that kind of thing. The ordinary Solicitor would not be expected to be thoroughly familiar with all these varied branches of law.

Because Barristers are supposed to act gratuitously that is why their fees are arranged and paid in advance. The Solicitors employing the Barristers are responsible for the payment of their fees and the Barrister cannot sue anybody unless, of course, the client has paid the Solicitor and the Solicitor has not accounted to the Barrister, then, of course, the Barrister can sue the Solicitor for money had and received but in most cases when this happens it is found that the Solicitor had been fraudulent and made away with the money.

Normally, the lay clients do not see Barristers although in an anxious or complicated case, if a client wishes to see his Barrister, this can be arranged, but Barristers are by the rules of their Association not allowed to see witnesses unless they be, for instance, expert witnesses in a patent case, or Chartered Accountants with complicated figures in taxation cases, or Surveyors or Valuators in Rating cases, and so forth.

Nor may a Barrister give any hint to a client or witness as to what in evidence he shall say or not say.

It is in these circumstances that all instructions for the trial of a case are normally given by the Solicitor to the Barrister in writing and the Brief, as it is called, includes copies of the supporting documents of the case together with Proofs of the evidence of the witnesses.

It has been said that most cases are won or lost in a Solicitor's office. The conduct of the case in Court requires great skill and judgment but unless the Barrister has been supplied with the proper and necessary material, how can he, in a difficult or doubtful case succeed against an opponent adequately armed? In fact, Briefs are usually delivered to the Leading Counsel in the case only a day or two before it goes into Court, so that he has not much time to think over it. If the papers are delivered to him too soon, he has forgotten them, if he is a busy man, even if he has read them; probably he puts the papers on one side and only reads them just prior to the trial. His chief business, when he has read them, is to consider what to say or not to say. Some of our greatest advocates are certainly those who say the least.

Barristers who practise in litigious matters in the High Courts of Justice have to settle the Pleadings and to sign them. By our strict law they are set out in the briefest language but as clearly as possible what is the nature of the supporting facts and what are the particular pleas. Counsel who are no good in arguing a case sometimes become very skilful when drawing Pleadings and this gets known to Solicitors, but usually the two things go together. A Barrister

must not plead law or refer to cases but you can depend on it that a clever Barrister in his form of plea he is very clever, in a certain kind of case, in seeing that the plea falls within some decision that has been well laid down, although the actual decision does not get quoted.

The Barrister is employed also a great deal in going into Chambers before the Masters, or under-Judges who deal with interlocutory matters before the case comes on in Court. There are often arguments as to whether a certain part of the Pleadings, Statement of Claim or Statement of Defense should be struck out. It has to be settled in each case whether a Counterclaim, for instance, should be permitted and whether there should be a Reply to the Counterclaim, or further pleading.

In general practice, Pleadings get closed at this point, but there can be Rejoinders and Surrejoinders. There are arguments as to whether certain documents are material and relevant in connection with Affidavits of Discovery which get ordered by the Master. There are keen debates about administration of Interrogatories or applications for Further and Better Particulars for Pleadings and so forth.

There can, of course, be great cases as to whether the plaintiff in a case (like in my Russian & English Bank case, the Bank having been "nationalised" in Russia) can sue in this country or whether the wretched Solicitor (myself) might have to pay the costs or if, having started the case, they have not a real client in existence.

The Masters in the Chancery Division and the Taxing Masters have formerly been Solicitors. The Masters in the King's Bench Division and Probate, Divorce and Admiralty or the corresponding persons in Bankruptcy (Registrars) have been Barristers.

All of them are selected by the Lord Chancellor of the day, and are for life during good behaviour and these offices are well-paid.

In ordinary cases an ordinary "junior" Barrister will undertake the hearing in Court but in the more important cases, or where there is a well-to-do client, a Leader, namely, a King's Counsel, is employed.

The time comes when a "junior" Barrister who is overwhelmed with work and wishes to have less of the above kind of work applies to the Lord Chancellor of the day to make him a King's Counsel. The change is a great gamble. I have known many a successful Junior get no work on becoming a King's Counsel. Except for the Specialists amongst King's Counsel, an ordinary King's Counsel has to be an able advocate in Court, able at making speeches, able at examining, cross-examining and re-examining witnesses, able at the hustle and bustle of getting a case "on its legs" if for the plaintiff, able on getting his defense established clearly, if for the defense. Being a man of integrity and learning, his chief quality, I always think, must be that of persuasiveness—the kind of man who understands what a Judge and Jury is thinking and addresses himself to those

particular points, so as to persuade them to his standpoint. His arguments and speeches often read badly and in reading the transcript or written reports of proceedings one often wonders why he omits to ask certain questions and also why with regard to a certain type of witness he is not more aggressive. The best example of a persuasive Counsel in my time was Rufus Isaacs (subsequently Lord Reading, Lord Chief Justice); he used to understand what eleven out of twelve jurors were thinking and at the same time the Judge and if he was satisfied they were with him, he was only trying to convince the twelfth man in the Jury. The art of persuading Judges in the Court of First Instance, the Court of Appeal or House of Lords is an art requiring many years of great experience in many a battle of wit and learning, above all in adaptability and reasoning.

The time comes when a Junior Barrister wishes to be a Leader; the Barrister I have been talking about is called a Junior, though he is often fifty or even sixty years of age and perhaps in a particular case, his Leader, a King's Counsel, is only 40 years of age.

Many of our Barristers love politics and are Members of Parliament, and certainly a great many of the leading King's Counsel are Members of Parliament. The public and juries and Judges, like their clients, do not seem to mind what their politics may be, whether they be Conservative, Liberal, Labour or Socialistic or of no politics at all.

A King's Counsel no longer may sign Pleadings. Perhaps once in every two or three years in a very heavy or unusual type of case a Solicitor may ask the King's Counsel who is going to have conduct of it in Court if he would kindly assist the Junior in settling a complicated or unusual Pleading, but the King's Counsel's name must not go on the Pleading.

When a Junior wishes to become a King's Counsel, he writes a brief letter to that effect to the Lord Chancellor. I cannot imagine a situation when the Lord Chancellor does not know about the Junior; however, if he is in ignorance he no doubt would consult the Law officers or Judges, or even, very cautiously, some leading men at the Bar.

King's Counsel usually get appointed in February or thereabouts every year. Not many get selected and the Lord Chancellor sends a list of the proposed names to every Junior Barrister who is senior in date of calling to them, so that if any of the Senior men might wish also to add their names, their names can be so added to the list of proposed King's Counsel.

In the ordinary way, when the Government comes into office it selects the Attorney-General and the Solicitor-General from the leading King's Counsel belonging to its party.

A person who is a King's Counsel theoretically is not supposed to appear against the Crown in a criminal case without the Crown's permission. In fact, such permission is never withheld; otherwise in criminal cases (this memorandum has not been dealing with the criminal side of our law) it would be

impossible for a prisoner to secure the services of King's Counsel. Indeed, as regards the Criminal Bar, there are Junior Barristers who are called Treasury Counsel, which merely means that the Crown has the right to their services unless their services have already been engaged for the defendant, but as in the case of a King's Counsel, no Treasury Counsel can take up the case for a defendant without first communicating with the Treasury and finding out that it has no ojection.

If so far I have made myself quite clear to you, I would add that in recent years, owing to the growth of population, cases are tried very frequently on Assizes in the Provinces, there are eight "Circuits" for Assizes, and there are local Bars as regards Junior Barristers practising, for instance, at Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and Leeds, although on Circuit, every Counsel has to have Chambers in one of the Inns of Court in London.

Junior Barristers join a Circuit on being called and remain with their Circuit ever subsequently, so that when the Judges go on Assize, many of the Barristers of the Circuit follow him. Barrister from any other Circuit can be retained for a client at an extra fee. The Solicitors in different towns usually favour a Barrister of the Circuit, especially if he happens to be a local Barrister or Barrister of the Circuit, well known in the district and therefore probably known to the Jury. In this way Barristers begin to get work, usually at the Criminal Bar and then in civil cases.

Articles Wanted!

***The Bulletin* Committee invites members to offer suggestions, and make criticisms, for the betterment of your monthly publication. Most of all we want contributions of articles by members on subjects of interest and assistance to others in practice. Every lawyer is capable of writing articles on some technical subject, arising out of his own practice experience. Won't you submit such material to the Committee? Send communications to the Bar Association office, 1124 Rowan Bldg.**

The Bulletin Committee.

PRESIDENT ASHBURN ANNOUNCES 1939 BAR COMMITTEES

Committee on Education and Public Information

Harry J. McClean, *General Chairman* (Board Member)

Section 1—Law Lectures

David Tannenbaum, *Vice-Chairman*
Maurice Saeta
Joseph Musgrove
George W. Dryer
Hon. Lester W. Roth
Dave F. Smith
Stevens Fargo

Section 2—Luncheons

C. E. McDowell, *Vice-Chairman*
Wm. Howard Nicholas
Paul W. Jones
George S. Dennison
Frederick E. Hines
Clyde C. Triplett
H. Eugene Breitenbach
George B. Gose, *Secretary*
Thomas S. Dabagh
Maurice Norcop

Section 3—Speakers

F. Murray Keslar, *Vice-Chairman*
Hon. W. Turney Fox
William C. Mathes
Ralph E. Lewis
Ralph G. Lindstrom

Section 4—Public Library

J. Harold Decker, *Vice-Chairman*
Preston D. Richards
Percy V. Hammon

Section 5—Radio Programs

William Thomas Davis, *Vice-Chairman*
Frank P. Doherty
Laurence W. Beilenson
Herbert Freston (Board Member)

Continuing Special Committee on Legal Aid

Julius V. Patrosso, *Chairman* (Board Member)
Hon. William Hazlett
Mrs. Dora Shaw Heffner
George R. Larwill
Frederic H. Vercoe
Hallock W. Hoag (Board Member)
Lawrence E. Drumm
Spencer C. Olin

Arbitration Committee

Paul Russell, *Chairman*
Hon. Lester W. Roth
Arthur C. Burt
C. P. Von Herzen
Joseph A. Allard, Jr.
William A. Page
Leon T. David
Leo M. Rosecrans
Guy T. Graves
C. H. Hartke
George W. Nix
John D. Fredericks, Jr.
Milton H. Schwartz
Roy V. Reppy (Board Member)

Committee on Legal Ethics

Ward Chapman, *Chairman*
Benjamin S. Crow
Mortimer A. Kline
Hon. Edwin F. Hahn
Mrs. Edna Covert Plummer
Lucius F. Chase
Louis G. Guernsey
Clyde E. Holley
Howard W. Wright
Philbrick McCoy
Marvin Chesebro
John G. Clock

Program Committee

George M. Breslin, *Chairman* (Board Member)
Loyd Wright
Kenneth N. Chantry
Gurney E. Newlin
Alex W. Davis
Kimpton Ellis
M. B. Silberberg
Laurence W. Beilenson

Golf Committee

Victor P. Showers, *Chairman*
Floyd Sisk
Howard F. Shepherd
Benson L. Smith
J. Clifford Argue
Oscar Moss
P. N. McCloskey
William P. Mealey
Hiram E. Casey

Committee on Pleading and Practice

Clifford E. Hughes, *Chairman*
Loren E. Butts
Arthur Rosenblum
Frederick F. Houser
H. Landon Morris
Louis P. Pink
James B. Salem
Robert A. Cushman
W. I. Gilbert, Jr.
Harold P. Huls
Hon. Willis I. Morrison
Raymond G. Stanbury
Isaac Pacht (Board Member)

Bulletin Committee

Ewell D. Moore, *Chairman* (Board Member)
John J. Ford
Charles R. Baird
A. S. Halstead, Jr.
F. Walton Brown
Warren Stratton
Robert E. Moore

Membership Committee
Paul Nourse, *Chairman*
F. B. Amend
Mrs. Rena Brewster
Arch H. Vernon
Edwin J. Miller
John W. Myers
Ewell D. Moore (Board Member)

Committee on Public Defender's List.
Edward W. Lloyd, *Chairman*

Section 1—County Public Defender
John G. Clock (Board Member)
William Howard Nicholas
J. Marion Wright
Everett Mattoon

Section 2—City Public Defender
John Clock (Board Member)
Delvy T. Walton
Ovila N. Normandin
W. Joseph McFarland

Committee on Corporations
Graham L. Sterling, Jr., *Chairman*
Paul R. Watkins
Raymond L. Haight
Harold C. Tallmadge
Frederick F. Barker
John Amos Fleming
Frank Karr
J. C. Macfarland (Board Member)

Committee on Experienced Lawyer Service
Courtney A. Teel, *Chairman*
Birney Donnell
H. Sidney Laughlin
Ernestine Stahlhut
Clyde F. Murphy
James E. Neville
H. L. Watt
Frank M. Moody (Board Member)

Judiciary Committee
Frank B. Belcher, *Chairman*
Hon. Dana R. Weller
Charles E. R. Fulcher
Forrest A. Betts
Walter F. Dunn
George L. Greer
Henry F. Prince
Herbert L. Hahn

Committee on Juvenile Court
Richard A. Turner, *Chairman*
Frank P. Sproul
George E. Lindelof, Jr.
Harold H. Krowech
Dr. Wendy Stewart
George A. Hooper
David A. Sondel
Hallack W. Hoag (Board Member)

Committee on American Citizenship
Michael F. Shannon, *Chairman*
Harold W. Schweitzer
Daniel T. O'Shea
George Bouchard
Emmett E. Doherty
Harriet A. Geary
Harley E. Riggins
Gail B. Selig
A. P. G. Steffes
Harry C. Mabry
James P. Keleher
Isidore B. Dockweiler (Board Member)

Committee on Constitutional Rights
Wm. Hazlett, *Chairman*
Edward D. Lyman
H. G. Bodkin
Henry I. Dockweiler
Otto J. Emme
Julius Smidt
Varian S. Green
William R. Litzenberg
C. E. Millikan
Isaac Pacht (Board Member)

Auxiliary Committee on Constitutional Rights
E. Avery Crary, *Chairman*
Edward T. Dillon
John C. Morrow
Van Cott Niven
Maurice O'Connor

Committee on Law Libraries
Earle M. Daniels, *Chairman*
Burdette J. Daniels
Ira C. Powers
Hiram Casey
Mrs. Winifred M. Ellis
Joe Crider, Jr.
John W. Holmes
I. Blair Evans (Board Member)

Committee on Legislation
Warren E. Libby, *Chairman*
Frank C. Weller
Ivan Kelso
L. H. Roseberry
Dave F. Smith
Charles E. Beardsley
Clyde Doyle
J. W. McKinley
J. C. Macfarland (Board Member)

Committee Re Employment of Junior Barristers
Edward D. Lyman, *Chairman*
Norman A. Bailie
Charles R. Baird
Alfred Wright
Byron C. Hanna
Chas. E. Millikan
B. F. Woodard
William Thomas Davis

Special Continuing Committee on Selection of Judges
Alexander Macdonald, *Chairman*
Henry O. Wheeler
John Perry Wood
Paul Watkins
Homer I. Mitchell
Jay J. Stein
M. C. Sparling
Herbert Freston (Board Member)
Betty Graydon
Wm. R. James

Committee on Fiduciary Accounting
Philbrick McCoy, *Chairman*
J. W. McKinley
Walter L. Nossaman
Shirley E. Meserve
Hallock W. Hoag (Board Member)
Karl R. Levy
Ben W. Utter
W. C. Mathes
David Tannenbaum

Special Permanent Committee on Judicial Independence
Michael G. Luddy, *Chairman*
Herbert Freston (Board Member)
Isaac Pacht (Board Member)
Joe Smith
Alexander Macdonald
Arnold Praeger
John J. Ford
J. C. Macfarland (Board Member)
Fred Aberle

Committee on Civil Service Examiners
Jerry Giesler, *Chairman*
Paul Vallee
Mark L. Herron

WATCH FOR UNAUTHORIZED PURPOSES IN CHARTERS

No charter will be issued in Ohio if purpose clauses in articles of incorporation disclose that professional services of any nature, including the practice of law, may be offered, Secretary of State Earl Griffith informed Joseph L. Stern, chairman of the Ohio State Bar Association's committee on unauthorized practice of law.

Griffith asked that the bar and the public be advised that his department intends to adhere to the strict enforcement of the following rule:

"No charter will be issued if the articles of incorporation disclose that any of the purpose clauses include acts which constitute the practice of law or the carrying on of any profession."

"This rule," Griffith said, "will be diligently and faithfully followed in spirit as well as in letter. Corporate names will be scrutinized and charters refused if the names suggest that professional services may be offered. The word 'counsel' will be rejected as misleading and improper as part of a corporate name."

RESULT OF LOS ANGELES BAR ASSOCIATION PLEBISCITE RE CANDIDATES FOR JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT

March 15, 1939

TOTAL BALLOTS SENT OUT	6340
TOTAL BALLOTS RETURNED	3035
TOTAL BALLOTS DISQUALIFIED AND NOT COUNTED	62

OFFICE 1	May D. Lahey	2298
OFFICE 2	Ellis A. Eagan	2216
OFFICE 3	Harold B. Landreth	2331
OFFICE 4	Leo Aggeler	2282
OFFICE 5	Joseph L. Call	1955
	Lee Baylor Stanton	681
OFFICE 6	Ray Brockman	2039
	Perry Thomas	691
OFFICE 7	Charles A. Ballreich	1113
	J. William Joos	542
	John A. Holland	430
	George M. Cuthbertson	373
	A. A. Golden	148
OFFICE 8	Frank G. Tyrrell	1671
	Eli F. Bush	849
	Sylvan Y. Allen	205
OFFICE 9	Charles Newell Carns	1893
OFFICE 10	Leo Freund	1508
	Donald Kolts	1125
OFFICE 11	Francis D. Tappaan	1829
	Charles P. Johnson	849
	J. E. Ingram	109
OFFICE 12	Louis W. Kaufman	1729
	Clarence L. Ripley	817

The ballots were sent to all members of the State Bar in Los Angeles County, and all judges of the trial courts.